

<Reports on the Ninth Annual Meeting of the
Tsukuba English Linguistic Society> X^o
-anaphors vs X_{max}-anaphors

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 著者 | Abe Jun, Iwata Seiji, Inagaki Daisuke, Watanabe Shin |
| journal or publication title | Tsukuba English Studies |
| volume | 8 |
| page range | 259-261 |
| year | 1989-08-31 |
| URL | http://hdl.handle.net/2241/7386 |

X⁰-anaphors vs. X^{max}-anaphors

Jun Abe, Seiji Iwata

Daisuke Inagaki, Shin Watanabe

In this study, we proposed movement of lexical anaphors at the level of LF, essentially following the framework presented in Pica (1986). Further we argued that the distribution of anaphors is regulated by the condition (A) of the binding theory and the E(mpty) C(ategory) P(rinciple).

It has been proposed that lexical anaphors move to the position closer to their antecedents from their surface positions (Belletti (1982), Lebeaux (1985), Chomsky (1986a), Pica (1986), among others). Pica (1986) argues that lexical anaphors are *unsaturated* arguments at S-structure in the sense that they do not have a fixed referent and they must be governed by their antecedents at LF to be licensed. Observing the data from Icelandic and Danish, he classifies lexical anaphors in these languages into two groups in terms of their morphological properties: X⁰-anaphors and X^{max}-anaphors. The former type of anaphors is rather peculiar in nature: they are not subject to the S(pecified) S(ubject) C(ondition) and subject oriented. Anaphors in the latter category are susceptible to the SSC and not subject oriented. Pica attributes the differences in syntactic behavior between X⁰-anaphors and X^{max}-anaphors to the differences of their behavior at LF. The government requirement by the antecedent are imposed on both X⁰-anaphors and X^{max}-anaphors. Further X⁰-anaphors are considered to be a clitic-like element which must be licensed by I(nfl), like the clitics in Romance languages, and the relevant movement proceeds in the form of head-movement. Then only the noun phrase which governs I(nfl), namely the subject, can be the antecedents of them. On the other hand, the movement of X^{max}-anaphors is triggered only by the government requirement in question and the operation is assumed to be a process of adjunction.

We took Pica (1986) as our point of departure and examined how the analysis can be extended to the anaphor binding in Japanese and

English. First we suggested that English has only one type of anaphors, namely X^{max} -anaphors. The following examples illustrate the point:

- (1) John₁ told Fred₂ about himself_{1/2}.
- (2) *John₁ expects Mary to like himself₁.

Hence, anaphors in English are on a par with X^{max} -anaphors in Icelandic and Danish in that they are not subject-oriented and subject to the SSC. Further we showed that the analysis makes it possible to dispense with the notion of *SUBJECT* in explaining the fact that anaphors cannot appear in the subject position of an embedded tensed clause in English (the NIC-effect). Along the line, examples like that in (3) can be excluded as an ECP-violation.

- (3) Mary₁ thought that herself₁ was a genius.

Second we argued that Japanese has two types of anaphors as Icelandic and Danish. In particular, the reflexive anaphor *zibun*, on the one hand, should be regarded as an X^0 -anaphors, since it is not subject to the SSC and shows the subject-orientation effect. On the other hand, *zibunzisin* should be an X^{max} -anaphor, since it behaves like anaphors in English and those of Icelandic and Danish regarded as X^{max} -anaphors by Pica. The points are illustrated in the following examples:

- (4) John₁-ga Mary-ga zibun₁/zibunzisin_{*1}-o suki-da to omotteiru
 NOM NOM self ACC like COMP think
 "John thinks that Mary likes self."

- (5) John₁-ga Mary₂-ni zibun_{1/*2}/zibunzisin_{1/2}-no syasin -o
 NOM DAT self GEN picture ACC
 miseta
 showed
 "John showed Mary pictures of self."

It is suggested in (4) that unlike *zibunzisin*, *zibun* is not subject to the SSC. The example in (5) shows that only *zibun*, not *zibunzisin*, is subject oriented. As shown in the following, *zibunzisin* can appear as the subject of an embedded clause:

- (6) John₁-ga *zibunzisin*₁-ga Mary-o korosita to itta
 NOM self NOM ACC killed COMP said
 " *John said that himself killed Mary."

This sharply contrasts with the sentence in (3). We explained this fact by assuming that the Japanese language does not have the projection of C.